

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/820,272

Applicant(s)

SUEMASU ET AL

Examiner

Katherine A. Bareford

Art Unit

1792

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine A. Bareford

(3) _____

(2) James Harrington

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 24 March 2009

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant

2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed wording of the claims as to the provision of a metal layer on the first surface of the substrate, with the Examiner noting that applicant could provide an oxide layer on the substrate to which the metal layer is directly adhered as in present figure 5. The Examiner also noted applicant's citation of Japan 4-206875 from the IDS of 1/15/09.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Katherine A. Bareford/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792